

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-7877**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANIF CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District Judge. (CR-93-10; CA-04-627)

---

Submitted: February 24, 2005

Decided: March 9, 2005

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anif Christopher Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Ruth Elizabeth Plagenhoef, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Anif Christopher Williams, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his motion filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b), which the district court construed as a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED